

Remarks

Claims 1-24, 26-51, and 53-55 are currently pending, and claims 1, 10, 18, 26, 30, 40, 45, 51, and 53-55 have been amended. Applicants assert that all claims are in condition for allowance as set forth more fully below.

Interview Summary

The undersigned participated in a telephone interview with the Examiner on December 21, 2004. During the interview, deficiencies in the Strauss reference were discussed in relation to subject matter of the present invention. Namely, it was discussed that any online session data of Strauss is related to the establishment of a voice over IP call between two online users and does not pertain to providing an indication to a calling party that an end of the online session of a user to be called has occurred such that the calling party can place a call to the user once the user is no longer online. During the discussion, the Examiner introduced a new reference, Shaked (US 2002/0007411), for further consideration in relation to the Boston Globe article, "Harried AOL Customers...".

102 Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 18-24, 27, 30, 31, 37, 38, and 45 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Strauss (US Pat 6,272,126). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

These claims refer to online session data that pertains to whether a party to be called has ended an online session so that the party may be called once the online session has ended. As a representative example, amended claim 1 recites, in part, receiving online session data that specifies users who have ended recent online sessions, processing the online session data to identify users to call who have recently ended their online sessions, and calling the users who have recently ended their online sessions.

Strauss fails to disclose these elements. Strauss is not concerned with detecting whether a user has ended an online session so that a call can be placed to the user after the online session has ended. To the contrary, Strauss is interested in establishing a voice over IP call between two users that are online. Any online session data disclosed by

Strauss is data used to establish the voice over IP call, rather than data specifying that an online session of a user to be called has ended such that a call may now be placed to the user. Therefore, these claims including claims 1, 18, 30, and 45 include recitations not disclosed by Strauss such that they are allowable over Strauss for at least these reasons.

In relation to the newly introduced Shaked reference (US 2002/0007411), this reference discloses providing online session data to an online service provider for purposes of identifying a user who is online, such as for preventing fraud during online activities. There is no discussion of providing online session data including data indicating when the user has connected or disconnected to a third party who wishes to place a call to the user upon the user ending the online session. Those interested in the online session data of Shaked have no interest in knowing that the user has ended the online session so as to place a call to the user.

In relation to the Boston Globe article “Harried AOL customers...”, (hereinafter AOL) this reference discloses an ISP providing a third party with the telephone number of the users who establish online sessions, but it does not disclose providing online session data to a third party interested in calling the user that specifies that the user has ended an online session. There is no disclosure that the third party has any interest in knowing whether the user is online or offline. Therefore, should the Examiner consider combining Shaked with AOL, there still fails to be a teaching of providing online session data to a party who places a call to a user based on the online session data specifying that the user has ended the online session. Accordingly, claims 1, 18, 30, and 45 are also allowable over these references, singly or in combination.

Dependent claims 2-9, 19-24, 26-29, 31-29, and 46-50 depend from allowable base claims and are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

103 Rejections

Claims 9, 11, 12, 29, 32-35, and 39 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strauss. Claims 2, 5, 6, 10, 13-17, 25, 26, 36, 38, 40-44, and 46-55 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strauss in view of Papierniak (US Pat 6,714,931). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claims 10, 40, and 51 include recitations similar to those discussed above in relation to claim 1. As noted above, Strauss, Shaked, and AOL each fail to disclose such recitations, whereby a party places a call to a user based on the online session data specifying that the user has ended the online session. Furthermore, Papierniak also fails to disclose such recitations as Papierniak is concerned with identifying users so as to monitor online behavior so as to develop effective websites. Therefore, claims 10, 40, and 51 are allowable over the cited references, single or in combination.

Dependent claims 9, 11-17, 29, 32-35, 39, 41-44, and 53-55 depend from allowable base claims and are also allowable for at least the same reasons.


Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 1-24, 26-51, and 53-55 is now in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments and remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 22, 2004


Jeramie J. Keys
Reg. No. 42,724

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355
(404) 849.2093